DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 757 IR 004 538

AUTHOR Meadow, Charles T.; And Others
TITLE A Plan for Library Cooperation in Pennsylvania.
INSTITUTION Drexel Univ., Philadelphia, Pa. Graduate School of Library Science.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State Library, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE Jul 76
NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *Budgeting; *Cooperative Planning; Costs; Guidelines; Information Networks; Libraries; *Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; *Library Planning; Program Proposals; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

A five year plan and budget for Pennsylvania library cooperative activities is outlined based on two goals: (1) libraries should support state educational, industrial, governmental, health and other information programs by joining in a statewide library network to provide all publicly available information in the state to any citizen; and (2) libraries should serve as the link between the user's information needs and the library and non-library world of information. Interviews with library consortia representatives and librarians, and review of plans in other states reveal the strength of existing cooperative programs upon which proposals for new management procedures are built. Principal recommendations are: (1) better methods of library service delivery between cooperating institutions--i.e., location of materials and administration of interlibrary loans; (2) more effective leadership emphasizing the central role of the State Library; and (3) evaluation methods for cooperative activities. Changes in legislation are proposed to enable any library in the State to obtain service from any state aided library. (Author/KP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136757

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A PLAN FOR LIBRARY COOPERATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

Project No. 75-1-III

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Grace I. Wozniak

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Submitted to the State Library of Pennsylvania

Ernest E. Doerschuk, Jr.
State Librarian

by

Charles T. Meadow
Thomas Childers
Rosemary Weber
John B. Hall
Richard Eggleton
D. Jean Rafsnider

Graduate School of Library Science
Drexel University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

July 6, 1976

I R0045538

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

The language and contents of this publication are those of the author alone and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Foreword	iv
	Abstract	v
1.	Preface	1
2.	Goals of a Library Cooperation Program	3
3.	Constraints and Assumptions	4
4.	Objectives	6
5.	The Program Plan	11
6.	Findings	28
7.	Review of Applicable Literature	34
8.	Methodology	37
9.	Glossary	47

FOREWORD

Although library cooperation is not a new concept or practice, there is an increasing need for a well-coordinated network linking all libraries in Pennsylvania.

We see all kinds of libraries operating under severe fiscal constraints while the volume of publishing and the need for information continue unabated. But we find encouragement in (1) improved communication among libraries, (2) increased access to computerized information bases, and (3) the emergence of a national program of library services under the leadership of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

This report summarizes a study commissioned by the State Library under Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act to provide a basis for planning improved cooperation among Pennsylvania libraries. It is strictly a report of the Drexel University special study staff, not of the State Library, but we are publishing it for wide distribution because it makes specific suggestions for action based on prevailing conditions and the potential benefits of improved networks.

Ernest E. Doerschuk, Jr.
State Librarian

ABSTRACT

This report is the product of a nine-month study by staff members of the Drexel University Graduate School of Library Science. Its purpose is to present a workable plan and budget for library cooperative activities in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the five year period 1976-1981.

The principal recommendations made are for better methods of delivery of library service between cooperating institutions--the location of materials, the administration of interlibrary loans and the physical delivery of materials; for more effective leadership of library cooperative activities in which the State Library would play the leading role; and for methods of evaluating library cooperative activities. Also proposed, as a high priority recommendation, are changes in legislation that would enable any library in the state to be a recipient of service from any stateaided library, such as a District Library Center, and for the State Librarian to arrange aid in exchange for services with any library in the state.

The strength of existing library cooperative programs is noted and proposals for new management procedures build upon, rather than replace, these dynamic organizations. The program proposed is similar to that being developed in several other large, industrial states.

To accomplish the objectives recommended herein will unquestionably call for increased funds for the State Library if Pennsylvania is to maintain the level of library service its citizens and government, industrial, academic, service and health institutions need. The plan stresses, however, that much can be done even without an increase in budget.

1. PREFACE

> Every enterprise of contemporary society, be it in government, industry, science or the humanities, depends increasingly upon rapid access to reliable information, whether it is stored in print or in computers at locations near or distant. Linking libraries and other information sources into service networks that can be tapped at will by information users is a vital task that is only partially achieved.
>
> Milton J. Shapp, *Governor of Pennsylvania*
> May 8, 1976

Addressing these words to the Special Libraries Association, Governor Shapp underscored the importance of making the vast range of society's information more widely available to society's varied interest groups by linking information resources (including, but not limited to, libraries) together, and by improving the user's access to those resources.

This report is the result of a study performed by members of the Graduate School of Library Science, Drexel University, for the State Library of Pennsylvania. The objective of the study was to develop a general plan for cooperation among the State's library-based information resources. It is understood that this objective, though broad, does not respond to the whole charge implied in the Governor's statement above. However, we hope our study and this report will prove to be a significant contribution toward the broader goals he envisioned.

The report is organized into two major parts. Part I contains the plan for cooperation beginning with a statement of goals (Section 2); constraints and assumptions (Section 3); objectives (Section 4); the specific programs proposed, tasks within programs, and cost estimates (Section 5). Part II provides the background upon which the plan for cooperation has been based. It contains findings of the study, consisting of reactions of librarians interviewed and an assessment of the climate for cooperation in the state (Section 6); and a brief survey of other states' plans and comparisons with this one (Section 7). A description of the methodology of the study and list of persons interviewed and consulted is in Section 8. Section 9 contains a brief glossary of acronyms used in the report.

A plan is a guide to action. It is necessarily limited by the information available at the time of its writing. The information that has gone into the following plan for library cooperation consisted of (1) information that was already available in the form of statistics, studies and other documents related to Pennsylvania and other states and (2) information collected through interviews and meetings expressly for the present study. In both cases the information has been limited in its scope or completeness. Consequently, while our proposed plan reaches a greater level of detail than did the Pennsylvania Library Master Plan, it must be understood that the actual implementation of this plan will

require additional, more detailed planning at all levels, and additional data upon which to base additional planning.

It has been said by many planners that the principal value of a plan lies in its making—that those involved gain so much in insight that, whether or not the plan is ever implemented, they have come to a better understanding of the world for which they have planned, and are better able to cope with the changes that often prevent implementation of plans. We feel this applies as well to those involved in this study—both the study team and those to whom we talked during the study.

The proposed plan is presented within a framework of five years. We wish to acknowledge gratefully the assistance given us by many people in the conduct of this study. We were assisted by Mr. Ernest E. Doerschuk, Jr., the State Librarian, Ms. Patricia Broderick, Director of the Bureau of Library Development, and especially by Mr. David R. Hoffman who helped us in ways too many to recount. We thank also the approximately 100 librarians who were interviewed during the study and those who attended our meetings in Philadelphia and Harrisburg.

Drexel University
Philadelphia
July, 1976

Charles T. Meadow, *Professor, Project Director*
Thomas Childers, *Associate Professor*
Rosemary Weber, *Assistant Professor*
John Hall, *Assistant Professor*
Richard Eggleton, *Research Assistant*
D. Jean Rafsnider, *Research Assistant*

2. GOALS OF A LIBRARY COOPERATION PROGRAM

Information is a fundamental resource in nearly all human activities. As the national economy moves more and more from an industrial to a service base and as the scale of American society increases, information becomes more important as a basis for further growth and as a link between individuals and the resources of this complex society.

Over the years many writers, both within and outside the field of library science, have discussed the possibility of interconnecting all existing collections of information in an area—or in the nation—so that any potential user could gain access to that area's (or the nation's) information store from a single local point. Computers and communications technology have made these dreams mechanically possible and, sometimes, economical. Some examples of interconnections among stores of information already exist, in banking: automated clearinghouses and telephone checking; in transportation: automated reservations systems; in police work: National Crime Information Center, carrying data nation-wide on stolen items and fugitives; in education: scoring and reporting scores on national tests; and in legislation: information systems to report the status of bills in progress.

Libraries, too, have increased their role as interconnectors of existing information resources. Of course, interlibrary loan of materials is an established activity that goes back many decades. More recently some libraries have begun providing their clients with links to huge remote bibliographic data bases (such as the New York Times Data Bank and the Lockheed/DIALOG system); some other libraries have undertaken to serve as a directory to all informational and human service resources of their respective communities.

Two goals have guided the study and recommendations reported in the following pages:

1. Libraries in Pennsylvania should support the educational, industrial, governmental, health and other information programs in the Commonwealth, by joining together in a statewide library network to provide all publicly available information in the state to any citizen who needs it.
2. The libraries in the Commonwealth should serve as the link between the user's information needs and the broad world of information, both library-based and non-library.

The implications of these goals are that the information programs of libraries must change as other information programs and society's information needs change, and that libraries must more actively interface with non-library information sources than they have in the past.

3. CONSTRAINTS AND ASSUMPTIONS

In working toward the goals set forth in the preceding section, we recognize certain constraints and make certain assumptions concerning the real world in which Pennsylvania libraries will operate. These are listed here both in explanation of the planning approach adopted and because changes in the conditions underlying these assumptions and constraints, at some future date, might necessitate a change in plans.

3.1 Funding Level

The State Library and many other libraries in Pennsylvania are partially dependent on Federal funds for their operation, yet the future level of this support is uncertain. The State Government is trying to hold its level of spending in check hence the prospect for great amounts of additional funds for library activities in Pennsylvania is not bright. We are assuming that this situation is likely to continue for the foreseeable future and that the country will not return to the high levels of spending for education and libraries that were characteristic of the 1960's.

3.2 State Aid to Local Libraries

State aid to local Pennsylvania public libraries is provided by statutory authority. In some states this is not done; rather, state aid is provided via services and materials through a strong state library system. However, we are assuming that because Pennsylvania's local governments have, over the years, become dependent on direct state aid for their libraries, it will not be feasible to withdraw it. Hence, we have not considered this as a means to increase the discretionary funds available to the State Library.

3.3 Existing Cooperative Organizations

There are many existing library cooperative organizations in Pennsylvania, with various sources of funding—for example, the Association of State College and University Library Directors (state funds), the Mid-Eastern Regional Medical Library Service (federal funds), the Pittsburgh Regional Library Center (a combination of private foundation, state and library-contributed funds) and the Tri-State College Library Cooperative (financed by membership). Such organizations as these have been built up over many years and represent a decided strength. We assume it would be to everyone's advantage to retain as much of this existing organizational strength as possible.

3.4 Library Technology

As in most fields, technology, properly used, can increase productivity. Much of library technology is based on computers and communications hardware. We assume that engineering advances in these fields will continue, enabling more work to be done at lower relative cost, over time. We can predict with near certainty that there will be such advances but cannot predict exactly what they will be.

3.5 The Authority Structure in Cooperatives

Library cooperatives are almost invariably structured with loose authority relationships. A consortium bears a much different relationship to a member library than a corporate headquarters does to its branch office. Cooperatives do not enjoy strong line authority over their members; for instance, a cooperative cannot ordinarily specify how its members shall spend their funds, except by charging fees or dues. Hence, decisions by the cooperative cannot be easily imposed on member libraries without the members' willingness.

3.6 Library Management

Libraries exist within non-library settings (a university, a school, a company, a city government). Rarely does a library director "report to," in the management sense, a higher authority who is also a library director. By contrast, a typical manager of engineering in a corporation will often report to another engineer, or an attorney to another attorney. Hence, the library director's organizational superior may have little knowledge of the library's role or requirements.

3.7 Library Budgets

Libraries are rarely high-visibility items in the budgets of their parent organizations (university, school, company, city, etc.) Their budget allocations are less volatile than many programs, which may mean that their budgets do not rise to meet inflation as rapidly as those of other departments of the parent organization. Hence, libraries, unlike many of their counterpart organizations in government, education or industry, may have to face inflationary periods with static budgets.

3.8 Effect of Economic Changes

Generally in adverse economic periods, demands on libraries increase, while income decreases or remains static. One result of decreased or static income may be reduced hours of operation, which reduces use and thereby the community's return on investment. A second result may be the increased tendency to share resources rather than purchase them, a decision made by individual users as well as libraries themselves.

3.9 Effect of Increased Service

Improved library service seems to create new demands for itself; that is, the better a service, the more people are likely to use it. This, of course is also true in commercial marketing of products and services, but in those cases, income from increased use is partially used to fund further expansions or product improvements. In the library world, increases in use, however socially desirable, may have to be accommodated within a static or sometimes deflating budget.

4. OBJECTIVES

In order to achieve the goals stated in Section 2, under the assumptions and constraints stated in Section 3, we propose the following objectives toward the development of an integrated information network in Pennsylvania.

4.1 Delivery of Information to Users via Libraries

The first requirement is for an improved system for the location of library-based information anywhere in the Commonwealth, and for it to be made available to the user. Location and delivery services and increased access are the keys to improved library service—that is, increasing the range of material available to users, without increasing the holdings of each library. To accomplish this objective, five programs are required:

4.1.1 *Pennsylvania Union Catalog.* Individual libraries and their cooperative organizations should work toward creation of a combined (union) catalog of all library holdings in the state. Through such a state-wide union catalog a user or librarian can find the location of any work and, if at more than one location, the most economical one to borrow from.

4.1.2 *Reference and Referral Service.* As we envision that most libraries' holdings will be available to most users in the state through interlibrary lending, users will require increased assistance in searching catalogs and other bibliographic tools and in selecting items without actually seeing them. Not all libraries will have enough reference librarians of sufficient skill or subject knowledge to provide this assistance to users. Hence, a network of cooperating institutions should provide reference service by mail, telephone or other means of communication to patrons of any library. To some extent this already exists through the District Library Centers (DLC's) and Regional Resource Centers (RRC's) of the state, but we propose as a formal objective the integration of these into a state-wide network.

4.1.3 *Access to Library Services.* In order to speed the delivery of library-based information to every citizen, certain existing formal or informal limitations on service should be eliminated, to the extent possible. Primarily, prohibitions by certain types of libraries against providing full service to persons not within their formal constituency should be removed. Examples of this kind of prohibition are: an academic library's denial of free interlibrary loans to undergraduate students; a public library's denial of free borrowing privileges to non-residents of the municipality.

To the extent that libraries develop effective ties with other sources of information (see objective 4.5), improving an individual's access to library services will simultaneously improve his access to those "other" sources of information.

4.1.4 *Interlibrary Loan* (ILL). Until there is a radical change in publishing technology—that is, as long as the printed word is the primary means of information dissemination—ILL will continue to be the major form of interlibrary cooperation. Since no library can buy everything, virtually every library is dependent on others to some extent for the loan of materials. The ILL program in Pennsylvania should be continued and improved in the following ways: reduced cost of lending (administration of borrowers' requests and transportation), equitable distribution of the burden of lending among all libraries, and increased speed of delivery.

4.1.5 *Delivery Service*. Pennsylvania has an excellent service, the Interlibrary Delivery Service of Pennsylvania, to transport library materials between libraries. However, it needs to be extended, especially to cover more sparsely settled areas. Currently, libraries ship by truck or through the U.S. mail. In the far distant future, other delivery forms such as facsimile or television may become important. Ideally, a delivery system would enable libraries to strike the most economic balance between local ownership of information materials and the cost of transporting them between institutions.

4.2 Technical and Administrative Service to Libraries

Library technical and administrative services are usually not apparent to users, but they are the basis for providing effective public service. They include: cataloging, the selection, ordering and processing of materials, budgeting, maintaining operating statistics, personnel management, etc. Often, it is in the domain of technical and administrative services that the greatest cost reductions can be achieved, thus releasing funds for more *direct* user services. Specific objectives are:

4.2.1 *Technical Services*. A program of cooperative assistance in the performing of technical services (serials control, acquisition, interlibrary loan administration, etc.) is needed. It is already available to some extent through the shared cataloging system of the Ohio College Library Center, (OCLC), which provides direct access to cataloging information through a telephone link to the OCLC computer. OCLC intends to extend itself into other technical services in the future.

4.2.2 *Cooperation in Collection Building and Maintenance*. No library can buy all the material published today and hardly any library can afford the expense of holding, in existing buildings, all materials it has ever purchased. Cooperative programs should assist libraries in coordinating their purchasing in such ways as to assure minimum duplication and the maintenance of comprehensive collections in specific subject areas. Also, cooperative plans can be made for disposal of older, less frequently used materials in such a way that a minimum number of little-used items are stored within the state's libraries.

4.2.3 *Continuing Professional Education*. Library and information service is in a period of rapid change. It is to the benefit of the citizens for librarians and their management to keep abreast of developments in library technology, management skills, the external (socio-political)

environment, perceptions of the role of libraries in education, government, industry and culture, etc. Since there is no single agency in Pennsylvania charged with this general responsibility, it is proposed here that this be developed as a cooperative program.

4.2.4 *Telecommunications.* For both administrative and reference purposes, high speed communications between libraries is important. Interlibrary cooperation requires interlibrary communication. Current needs are in telephone or teletype service. Future needs may extend to high-capacity digital communications or video transmission.

4.2.5 *Insurance Program.* Currently, one of the often-stated reasons for libraries to refuse to lend to certain classes of other libraries or individuals is lack of control over the ultimate user in case of damage or loss of the material lent. We propose, therefore, a reimbursement program to insure libraries that lend material to other libraries or to borrowers not in their normal jurisdiction (e.g. residents of a township or students at a school) against loss as a result of such transaction.

4.3 Management of Cooperative Library Activities

In states without Pennsylvania's history of interlibrary cooperation, new state-wide organizations are being created to manage the new state-sponsored library systems. We have made the assumption that it would be better to keep the existing, strong, but separate cooperating organizations. What is needed is a means of increasing the number of local cooperatives and of integrating the others into a truly state-wide system, with minimal impact on their history of independence of action.

4.3.1 *Organization for Cooperation.* Although there are strong cooperative programs in existence, a three-pronged objective must be to: (a) increase the number of consortia based on geographic proximity or subject matter so that all libraries may have the benefits of a near-by cooperative program, (b) strengthen (broaden, intensify) the District Library Center program, and (c) develop effective leadership of the existing consortia to strengthen library cooperation.

4.3.2 *Program for Evaluating State-Aided Library Services.* The library profession in general lacks both data and methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of its programs. Criteria for program evaluation and operational programs for carrying out evaluations should be developed for all library programs supported by state aid or administered by the State Library: local libraries receiving statutory support, DLC's, RRC's and library consortia. To accomplish these objectives, a program for gathering managerial data will also be necessary.

4.3.3 *Research and Information.* In addition to collecting data on evaluation of programs (4.3.2) the State Library should carry out two research oriented programs: (1) dissemination of research findings with applicability to library cooperative practice; (2) studies of user requirements and attitudes.

4.4 Legislation, Regulation and Standards

In order to achieve all the other objectives, some changes are necessary in current legislation and in regulations under which the State Library operates. In addition, there will be need for voluntary standards among cooperative libraries.

4.4.1 *Legislation.* The State Library, in conjunction with appropriate other library-related organizations, should seek to effect legislative changes to authorize the State Library to develop services to libraries of all types in the Commonwealth. Present law does not appear to prohibit this practice, but neither does it expressly authorize it.

4.4.2 *Regulation.* Regulations governing state aid to local (or other) libraries, library cooperative organizations or to District Library Centers and Regional Resource Centers should be modernized and should reflect the need for all to work toward a coordinated state library system. As the program of developing evaluation criteria progresses, use of these criteria should become part of the regulatory process.

4.4.3 *Standards.* A program of standards is needed to govern the exchange of data and materials (i.e. forms, procedures), lending codes and governance of consortia. A specific objective of the standards program should be to develop lending codes that do not discriminate against any class of library user, such as students, or any borrowing institution.

4.5 Linking Library-based and Non-library Information Sources

The bulk of this study and its recommendations are directed toward developing new or better forms of cooperation among libraries in the state. However, the words of Governor Shapp on the first page can be taken as a charge that transcends institutional boundaries and obliges us to treat, however briefly, information sources outside libraries.

It has been documented in the literatures of several fields (science, technology, sociology) that published sources of information are far from the only sources of information that are used. Even among such highly educated people as bench scientists, there appears to be tremendous reliance upon interpersonal information sources; significant amounts of their critical information needs are met not through documents but through colleagues. We know that the average, non-specialist adult relies even less on published sources of information, and that libraries are rarely considered a likely channel of information for problem-solving (Warner, et al. *Information Needs of Urban Residents).* In short there is considerable evidence that published documents are not the only—or even primary—source of people's information and, even more, libraries have heretofore not been a significant channel of information for some people.

There are many forms of unpublished information. Information exists unassembled in the files of corporations and other organizations, in pre-published drafts of papers and unpublished internal reports, in obscure statistical documents, in automated data banks, in people's minds and

elsewhere. Gaining access to *all* of these stores of information would be unfeasible at the present time. While we may have the technology to undertake such comprehensive access, we are still lacking the economic wherewithal, the social mandate, and the legal framework that would permit it.

4.5.1 *Information and Referral Service.* In the field of social work—and increasingly in public libraries in recent years—it has become quite apparent that a vast amount of hitherto untapped information can be made available by linking together existing public service agencies (and private ones, to a lesser extent) through what is known as information and referral service (I & R). I & R provides access to non-bibliographic information of almost any nature. The service is based on the local compilation of a directory of resources available to the client—services, activities, non-library information sources, advice (all of which contain an "information" component). The client is put in contact with the resource that best meets his need.

By and large, I & R service is community-specific; resources listed in an I & R file are primarily *local* resources, convenient to the users. The applicability of library cooperation to such programs is in providing mutual assistance in setting up and operating programs and in the sharing of data on resources outside the local area. Libraries could share the technical expertise that underlies I & R service, as well as information on state and federal services or on other services and activities in distant communities. A statewide consortium for the exchange of resource information and technical expertise, standardization of formats so that the exchange of information is facilitated, and sharing in training efforts related to I & R—all would aid in the efficient growth of I & R in the state.

The development of statewide library I & R service in Pennsylvania's libraries would constitute the first significant step toward linking all the state's information sources for service to the citizen. Judging from the success of library I & R in other communities, such as Detroit, Houston and Baltimore County, and the documented inability of the average citizen to make his way through the myriad services and activities to the information he needs, we can expect that information and referral programs will soon be seen in Pennsylvania. A cooperative approach would greatly facilitate their growth.

5. THE PROGRAM PLAN

In this section we expand on the objectives stated in Section 4. Within each objective there are several programs and each program is further broken down into tasks. We have generally tried to group the tasks in a uniform way, under the headings: *analysis, planning, implementation* and *operation*.

Analysis, in this context, means a task devoted to gathering and study of data, generally before any operational plans can be made. It will usually be a one-time task, within the 5-year context of this report.

Planning means the creation of a program of action for some specific entity or organization and is also generally a one-time activity. Planning, as used in the following pages, implies development of performance measures for evaluation or purposes.

Implementation is the building or creation of a new entity or organization.

Operation is the routine, generally continuing, activity of an organization or entity. Operations will tend to require continuing financial commitments, while commitments to the other types of activity generally are not called upon for renewal.

The order of listing of programs follows the order of listing of objectives in Section 4. The recommended priority of each program is indicated by a letter code: A for highest priority class, B for second highest, C for third. It should be generally noted that many of the programs are interrelated, such as the creation of the union catalog with that of support to OCLC for technical services. Most activities are multifaceted and cannot be completely separated from each other. Also, priority of recommendation herein depends not only on the importance of the function but on the level of *existing* support or success. For example, we rate the importance of a delivery system quite high, but the success of the existing program, although not total, leads us to assign a priority class of B rather than A.

It must be recognized that in a brief study with limited data, such as this, it was not possible to go into great detail in any area. Planning is never complete until a system is operational. Any plan will leave some questions unanswered and can only assume that a succeeding phase will provide the answers. Hence, we frequently recommend a planning task for new programs, to further define the specifics of the program.

Cost estimates are approximate. Most of the tasks proposed herein are labor intensive. Libraries, consortia, universities and consulting firms have such widely different ways of computing the cost of human effort that there is no single standard. We have generally assumed that a person year costs $20,000 in salary plus 60% in fringe benefits and miscellaneous overhead charges. Travel, computer and other direct expenses are estimated at about 10% of the basic salary cost. This implies about $34,000 per person year. We have tried to plan for a period of five years and have made no adjustment for inflation over that period. In

some cases no estimate is made of the cost of the State Library performing a task, because we believe it could be done by re-assigning personnel rather than by expansion. In other cases, an estimate may not be made because it is dependent on a plan not yet completed.

It is most important to note at this point, though, that some of the State Library personnel assumed to be available for the various programs described below are being supported by federal funds. Should federal funding be terminated for these people, it will be necessary for the State Library to seek additional support—most likely from the Commonwealth—in order simply to maintain the status quo. The costs associated with the programs below, then, have assumed continued support from either federal or state sources for existing staffing levels.

5.1 Delivery of Information to Users

5.1.1 *Pennsylvania Union Catalog.* Description: A computer-stored record of the holdings (acquired after some stated beginning date) of all participating libraries in the Commonwealth. Participation should be by as many libraries as possible. OCLC is recommended as the mechanism of implementation, since many libraries (most of the larger ones) are already OCLC users. Eventually, the PUC would replace the old Union Library Catalog but would provide information on the holdings of all libraries at rapid speed. The Pennsylvania Area Library Network (PALINET) has already begun to work in this direction. The six-letter abbreviations of task titles are used to identify tasks in the budget in Section 5.7.

Priority: A

Tasks: 1. (UCPLAN) Plan for membership in PUC, its services and data collection related to members' and users' needs and to performance reporting. Cost: 1 person year, 1 elapsed year: $34,000.

2. (UCIMPL) Implementation. It is assumed that the cost of participation will be borne by individual libraries through local consortia where they exist or come into being. Implementation cost is restricted to management assistance. Cost: 1 person year, 1 elapsed year: $34,000.

3. (UCOPER) Operation. Cost of operation to be borne by participants, but State Library to support small management consulting effort. Cost: ½ person per year from existing State Library staff.

5.1.2 *Reference and Referral Service.* Description: A network of reference facilities throughout the state available on request to the staff of any type library or information facility and directly to private citizens. Most academic, public, school and special libraries or information centers would first use the services at a District Library Center, then go to the appropriate Regional Resource Center if the DLC could not solve the problem. Additional academic and special libraries could be commissioned by the State Library to assist as back-up resource centers if a RRC could not resolve the problem. Major academic and special libraries need not go through DLC's. Indeed, the purpose of doing so is only to insure that requests referred to other libraries be properly

formulated so as to minimize demands on RRC time. The objective is to give a citizen, a library, or information agency with a question an answer or a bibliographic reference, or a referral to an appropriate expert in a short time.

Priority: C (Relatively low because basis for the system already exists)

Tasks: 1. (RRPLAN) Planning. Cost: 1 person year, 1 elapsed year: $34,000.

2. (RRIMPL) Implementation. The assumption is that implementation will require only coordination among institutions already participating plus a few to be added as back-up reference centers. Cost: ½ person year, 1 elapsed year: $17,000.

3. (RROPER) Operation. No new funds required for operation (except for telecommunications, see 5.2.4). The cost of the service would be assumed under DLC or RRC cooperation and the cost of coordination by the State Library.

5.1.3 *Access to Library Services.* Description: The purpose is to increase the number of citizens' access points to information and to develop consistency in service levels throughout the state, as much as possible. In the long term— and perhaps idealistically—we would seek to secure equal access to *any* library's services by *any* citizen. Of course, there is a multitude of barriers to this level of equality. The major one centers around the problem of spending the resources of a given constituency on a member of another constituency. Despite this tremendous hurdle, however, some action can be taken to increase access to services. For instance, prohibitions against undergraduate use of interlibrary loan in academic libraries can be relaxed or removed; or, all types of libraries within a given geographic region could issue universal borrowing cards to any resident of that region. The legal, political and attitudinal barriers to improving access being as complex as they are, it will be important to approach this innovation with careful planning, and through a limited demonstration.

Priority: A

Tasks: 1. (ACPLAN) Planning and Analysis. Cost: ½ person year, 1 elapsed year: $17,000.

2. (ACIMPL) Implementation. Will require coordination among participating institutions within the geographic region chosen for demonstration. Cost: ½ person year, 1 elapsed year: $17,000.

3. (ACOPER) Operation. May necessitate financial compensation of some libraries for costs associated with extending access. Estimate of such costs must await analysis and planning phases, and would be dependent on the locality of the demonstration. Where possible, all costs should be borne by the participating libraries, providing *wide* participation can be assured.

5.1.4 *Interlibrary Loan.* Description: This is the oldest and most effective of the library cooperative activities. The value of interlibrary loan will be even more apparent as the union catalog is implemented,

delivery services improved and a state-wide reference and referral system fully implemented. The problems with interlibrary loan are principally: (1) restrictions on lending, by type of borrower (see 5.1.3); (2) hesitancy by some libraries to subject their materials to greater risk of loss by lending to other institutions (see 5.3.5); (3) a tendency for a few large libraries to become the overwhelming favorites of other libraries for loans, hence to be called on to donate an inordinate share to a cooperative venture. We address the third of these here.

Priority: B

Tasks: 1. (ILPLAN) Planning. Request the two major consortia (PALINET and PRLC) to develop interlibrary loan clearinghouses for *all* libraries in their portions of the state, based on the planned existence of a new union catalog on OCLC. In operation, the clearinghouse would inform a requesting library of the most appropriate library holding a work based upon an optimal combination of factors of location and previous loan load on the potential lender. Cost: ½ person year, 1 elapsed year: $17,000.

2. (ILOPER) Operation. Reimburse selected major libraries for interlibrary loan costs in excess of a base level to be arrived at by negotiation between the library and the State Library. All libraries should be obligated to participate as lenders, but none to contribute more than a "fair share" of its budget to this service. The libraries of state colleges and universities and state-related colleges and universities might be expected to contribute more than other institutions because they are public service institutions. Cost: To be determined (see task 3).

3. (ILANAL) Analysis. Establish with each libary which is a candidate for state support of its ILL program a base level of lending which would be expected of it and a required level of reimbursement per item beyond that. Cost: 1 person year, 1 elapsed year: $34,000.

5.1.5 *Film Cooperatives.* Description: First, a demonstration program, then, if that is successful, extension of the concept throughout the Commonwealth. Here again, some of the program is already in place in the Pennsylvania Public Library Film Center in Harrisburg and in smaller film collections in DLC's and in Intermediate Units (IU's). The objective is consolidation of collections and maintenance of 16mm films for more efficient use by citizens and libraries. The effect of such consolidation would be to reduce duplication of purchases and services. The program could be brought about in stages: reduction and eventual dropping of lending restrictions (especially between public libraries and schools), cooperation on acquisition, and eventual merger of facilities. (It might be noted that the state of Maryland has approached the school-public library lending problem by requiring that school-owned films be deposited in a public library-run center, with title being retained by the school to satisfy the requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that materials bought with funds under this law be used for school curriculum support.)

Priority: B

Tasks: 1. (FLPLAN) Planning and implementation of a demonstration program to develop one combined public library-school film center accessible by all types of libraries, most likely based upon the existing Pennsylvania Public Library Film Center, to test the concept and report to the State Library on the feasibility of extending it to other areas. Cost: ½ person for 2 years to plan and administer the joint program and report on prospects for extension: $34,000.

2. (FLEXT) Extension of concept to other districts, expanding on existing programs in DLC's and IU's. Exact cost is indeterminate until results of demonstration project are available. Cost would probably include cost of physical merging of storage and maintenance facilities, delivery systems, and supplementary film purchases.

3. (FLOPER) Operation. (a) State aid to assist in the purchase of films by the joint centers which might be about 25 in number (approximately the number of DLC's). $10,000 per center per year = $250,000 per year. (b) Possible statewide coordinated purchasing of little-used items could be overseen by SLP or a board of the film centers' representatives.

5.16 *Delivery Service.* Description: Expanding the routes of the present Interlibrary Delivery Service (IDS), linking this sytem into local routes operated by DLC's and IU's. Whether a special delivery service is better than reliance on postal service or United Parcel Service (UPS) should be readily discernible, but data is lacking. IDS estimates that its service, which costs a library subscriber $800 per year, saves an average library $256 in mailing costs alone. (We suspect this figure is low and may be between $300-400). There are other savings which may overshadow this, such as the cost of preparation for mailing. An average user of IDS sends about 1500 items per year. If a $3/hour clerk spends an average of five minutes on an item (high for a letter, low for packages that must be wrapped) then the added cost will be about $375 which, with the mail costs, approximately offsets the cost of the service. Most users find IDS service to be faster and more reliable than the mail, hence at a break-even cost, IDS is preferable. A further advantage to IDS is that many items sent via IDS are not logged; hence the actual saving may be higher than indicated. (Informal estimates run as high as 50% of items sent not being logged.)

Priority: B

Tasks: 1. (DEANAL) Analysis. Data is needed on traffic flows among libraries in the state, on comparative costs of service by private truck, mail and UPS, and on the feasibility of combining service with related delivery services, such as those operated by some Intermediate Units for school systems. This analysis would be complicated by the tendency, mentioned above, of some librarians not to record all transactions. Cost: ½ person year, 1 elapsed year: $17,000.

2. (DEPLAN) Planning. Based upon the data collected, a plan for state-wide coverage by delivery service should be devised. The plan

should provide for use of the most effective system in any locality, not necessarily all using IDS. This cost of a plan would probably be about ½ person year, depending upon findings of the analysis. $17,000.

3. (DEIMPL) Implementation. The date of any changes to be implemented is too far removed to estimate the exact nature of implementation at this time.

4. (DEOPER) Operation. Currently, the State Library assists members of IDS with about half the cost of membership for the first year. Thereafter, libraries must fund their own participation. As the system matures, special state grants to libraries for this purpose should not be necessary. It might be desirable to assist IDS with a grant to initiate some new, thereafter self-supporting service. The cost depends upon the analysis and planning phases.

5.2 Technical and Administrative Services to Libraries

5.2.1 *Technical Services.* Description: The major services are: cataloging, acquisition (i.e., book selection and ordering), serials control (check-in, ordering, claiming, subscription renewals), interlibrary loan, funds control. The Ohio College Library Center's shared cataloging system provides for computer assisted cataloging that many libraries, especially larger ones, find cost effective. Because OCLC also provides information as to which of its members or affiliates hold items, the system is often used as a location tool. OCLC has plans, although not yet specific, for adding acquisitions and serials check-in capabilities to its system. Each of these has the potential for reducing costs in some libraries. (Again, generally, the larger the library, the greater the potential cost reduction. A small one- or two-person library may gain nothing). The State Library has invested over $600,000 of Federal Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) funds in providing OCLC hardware to public and academic libraries in the state. In addition, some academic libraries have invested their own funds. Thus, the investment in OCLC for Pennsylvania libraries has been quite large. There seems no reason not to continue to look to OCLC for new services. The cost to an OCLC user of adding a new OCLC service will be much less than the cost of joining OCLC originally, because new hardware is not necessarily required. The "best bet" for technical services, then, is to continue to look to OCLC. (However, this should not exclude consideration of competing services.)

Many libraries do not rate technical services assistance high on their own priority lists. Partly this is because the reduction of manpower requirements due to automation creates new management challenges. The common reaction to OCLC to date has been that if it does reduce the need for certain cataloging staff, those staff are shifted to other areas of the library, not laid off. However at the time when OCLC is no longer state-subsidized, library management may be in the position of actually having to reduce staff in order to afford OCLC.

Priority: C (Largely because there is no urgency for any given service and because the best approach seems to be to wait for OCLC to implement new services.)

Tasks: 1. (OCPLAN) Plan for the use of OCLC terminals by more than one library, particularly in support of the creation of the Pennsylvania Union Catalog. ½ person year, 1 elapsed year: $17,000.

2. (TSPLAN) Plan for cooperative use of other technical services provided by OCLC. Actual cost depends upon actual services and dates announced. Estimated cost: ½ person year, 1 elapsed year for each major new service: total about $37,000.

3. (TSIMPL) Implementation of new services. Nature of task depends upon plans. Cost estimate depends upon specific plans.

4. (OCIMPL) Implementation of additional OCLC terminals. The SLP should provide funds for several additional OCLC terminals in libraries that did not take advantage of the opportunity in 1974-75 when the federal grant was available. Criteria for selection of grantees should stress service to cooperatives, not use within individual libraries. For example, the Mid-Eastern Regional Medical Library Service (MERMLS) should be considered, as should any other consortium not having a terminal among its membership or whose existing terminals cannot support the combined workload. Cost: $6,000 for terminals and one year's communications cost for about 6 consortia over several years. Total: $36,000 over 5 years.

5. (OCANAL) Analysis. Periodic review of OCLC operations as they affect library operations in Pennsylvania, including the possibility of regionalizing the service, extending to more libraries, implementing new services. Cost: equivalent of ¼ person year per year on continuing basis: $8,500 per year.

5.2.2 *Cooperation in Collection Building and Maintenance.* Description: Attempts at cooperative programs for acquisition (in the sense of agreements among libraries on what materials to buy) have not been very successful in the past except on an informal basis. The uncertainties of funding for libraries tend to make librarians wary of commitments to buy materials that they, themselves, do not absolutely need. They may also be reluctant to stop purchasing even little-needed items when adequate funds are available, even if the items are readily available elsewhere. There have been successes in libraries sharing duplicates and filling gaps in serials collections, and some exploration of joint agreements on selective retention of old or little-used material. In the full recognition that sensitive issues are involved, studies of the feasibility of solutions to these problems are recommended.

Priority: C

Tasks: 1. (COANAL) Analysis of collections in a selected metropolitan area with the purpose of determining whether coordinated acquisitions is possible and potentially beneficial. The payoff for such a system is potentially high through savings in materials' purchases. Cost: 1 person year, 1 elapsed year: $34,000.

2. (MAANAL) Analysis of requirements and problems in handling of little-used materials, including the possibility of a shared storage facility. Data as to the type material to be handled, amount of material, costs of storage and retrieval under various options must be collected. Such a study might be based on the suggestion of the Bryn Mawr and Haverford College Libraries for a shared storage facility in the Philadelphia area. Cost: 1 person year, 1 elapsed year: $34,000.

5.2.3 *Continuing Professional Education.* Description: The role of the State Library and of library cooperatives in education is primarily that of determining educational requirements of librarians and other staff members and sponsoring or coordinating the delivery of relevant educational programs. The basic requirement is for two types of programs. The first, for professional staff, is concerned with teaching the management, technology and operations of interlibrary cooperation. The second should be concerned with those who are in policy making or budget review positions with respect to libraries—such as trustees, academic or hospital administrators, school board heads, or industrial managers. It is important to help these people see the importance of libraries in their own organizations, the contribution of individual libraries to the state program and the value of library cooperative programs.

Priority: C

Tasks: 1. (PEPLAN) Plan continuing educational program for librarians related to library cooperation. This requires assembling information about educational programs available, resources available and program requirements. From these elements, a plan for delivery of educational programs should be devised, with emphasis on program offerings at or close to the work site of the persons to whom these are directed. This plan should be repeated at intervals of three to five years. Cost: ½ person year (first time): $17,000. Future plans might cost about half as much. It could be expected that library schools in the state, particularly those that are state related, will participate at minimal or no cost to the State Library.

2. (POPLAN) Plan an educational program for library policy makers. This is largely a public relations program among whose objectives would be raising the consciousness of library founders and governors about the importance of libraries and of their own libraries' contributions to the library program of Pennsylvania. Cost: ½ person year: $17,000.

3. (EDOPER) Operation. It has been the custom of the SLP to sponsor some educational programs. The plans to be drawn up might reconsider the best approach to state sponsorship, such as guaranteeing programs against loss, but encouraging existing educational institutions to undertake self-supporting programs. Possible cost per year: $10,000.

5.2.4 *Telecommunications.* Description: Communications facilities are needed to implement the mechanics of interlibrary loan (locating an

item, asking for its loan, confirming that a loan will be made), for reference service, for I & R service and for administrative cooperation. If two-way communication is needed, using U.S. mail or IDS for interlibrary loan or reference service lengthens a task that might take from a few minutes to several weeks. Messages about administrative matters can usually go by mail, but often at a far greater cost than that of a telephone call. Once again, we suffer from a lack of firm data upon which to make a selection of the technology needed. Telephone is by far the least expensive—the "terminals" are usually already in place and operators trained in their use. Teletype requires extra outlays for the terminal device and some minimal staff training. The recommended approach is to rely upon telephone until more data is available, and to reimburse all types of individual libraries being operated in the public interest for their telephone communication costs in connection with library cooperative activities, either directly from the State Library or through DLC's. Libraries should submit copies of invoices for reimbursement; this data will then provide a basis for re-analysis of the libraries' communications needs. It should be noted that such operator assisted calls as reversed charges or credit card use approximately triple the cost of telephoning.

Priority: B

Tasks: 1. (TEOPER) Operation. Authorize DLC's to reimburse local libraries and others they may be authorized to support for the cost of long distance telephone service in connection with library cooperative activities. Estimated cost: $10,000 per year.

2. (TEANAL) Analysis of data collected in reimbursal program, to determine communications requirements. Cost: ⅛ person year, ⅛ elapsed year: $5,000 computer services, total: $9,250.

3. (TEPLAN) Plan for new telecommunication system in support of interlibrary cooperation. Cost depends on results of analysis.

5.2.5 *Insurance Program.* Description: The objective is to foster interlibrary lending by removing one of the most often cited reasons against doing so: loss of lent materials. An insurance fund should reimburse libraries for loss or damage to materials lent to another library or to a patron not normally in the constituency of the lending library. The achievement of this program is likely to facilitate improvements in access to libraries (see 5.1.3). If it is feasible for the State Library to do so, it should operate the insurance fund. If not, the fund could be managed by a private organization, such as one of the major regional consortia or IDS.

Priority: C

Tasks: 1. (INPLAN) Plan. Review state government requirement, solicit opinions from private insurance firms, draft an approach either to a state-operated program or one operated by a private consortium. Cost: ½ person year, ½ elapsed year: $17,000.

2. (INIMPL) Implementation. Once the method of establishment is determined, the organization must be created and advertised.

Cost will depend upon the nature of organization recommended.

3. (INOPER) Operation. Depending upon data developed during the planning phase, it might prove desirable to have the State Library pay for the cost of operation, or this cost might be borne by members of the fund. Cost cannot be estimated at this time.

5.3 Management of Cooperative Library Activities

5.3.* *Organization for Cooperation.* Description: The basic recommended approach to organizing for cooperation is to take maximum advantage of the existing cooperative programs. There are three weaknesses in the present program: in some areas of the state there are no, or only moderately active, local consortia (e.g., the northwest); the DLC's exhibit varying degrees of performance; and there is no unified authority guiding all the consortia toward a common end. Overcoming these weaknesses is the objective of this program.

Priority: B

Tasks: 1. (MGOPER) Operation. The State Library should create or assist in the creation of local consortia where none now exist. Academic or special libraries, for example, may join both an area consortium and one based on subject matter or type or library. Generally, consortium leadership must be local. What can be done from the outside is to provide encouragement and administrative assistance; as well, grants to assist in planning and initial organization would be most beneficial. Cost: Approximately $5,000 to each of some 6 consortia over a three-year period: $30,000 per year for 3 years. (Even without additional funds, the SLP can encourage local librarians to form new consortia on the model of those that now exist.)

2. (MGEVAL) (The entire issue of evaluation of state-aided libraries is discussed in 5.3.2.)

3. (MGIMPL) Implementation. The centralized leadership of library programs in the state can only come from the State Library. Existing individual consortia were formed for the benefit of their own membership. The DLC's are concerned with only public libraries in their own districts. Only the State Library has the scope and authority to plan and act for the entire Commonwealth. It must consider state-wide interests in OCLC, in developing and enforcing library standards, and the governance of local consortia in such a way that they can benefit all the states' citizens. We recommend the establishment of a Council of Library Consortia, of which the State Librarian is an ex-officio member and chairman, to coordinate cooperative activities in the state and to advise the State Library on long and short term planning, policies on its expenditure of funds, and new legislation related to cooperative ventures. As an internal function of the State Library, the only additional cost would be that of supporting travel and expenses of the council's members. Cost: $10,000 per year.

5.3.2 *Program for Evaluating State-Aided Library Services.* Description: As the Commonwealth moves toward a coordinated state-wide library system and as the role of the State Library in funding and guiding this system increases, it becomes increasingly important to evaluate the role each component plays in the overall program and to monitor the success of the program as a whole. The establishment of a formal program for setting evaluation criteria, reporting progress and measuring performance is critical.

Priority: A

Tasks: 1. (REPLAN) Planning. Develop a realistic basis for reporting by individual libraries on their activities, accomplishments and expenditures. Such reporting should be required of all libraries supported by state funds. The planning should draw on related feasibility studies and demonstration in progress in libraries across the country. Cost: 1 person year, 1 elapsed year: $34,000.

2. (DLPLAN) Planning. Develop a set of criteria and a reporting system for District Library Centers and Regional Resource Centers. This is to include a uniform basis for reporting of performance and expenditures, including institutional overhead and indirect expenses. Cost: 1 person year, 1 elapsed year (after task 1): $34,000.

3. (CPPLAN) Planning. Develop a set of criteria and a reporting basis for library cooperative activities that are state-aided and voluntary reporting by those that are not. Cost: 1 person year, 1 elapsed year: $34,000.

Note: If tasks 1 through 3 are undertaken simultaneously by a single staff, it is likely that they can all be accomplished within the limit of 2 to 2½ person years: $68,000-$85,000.

4. (EVIMPL) Implementation following tasks 1-3, and the costs, will depend wholly upon the outcome of those tasks.

5. (MIPLAN) Plan. The State Library should plan a state-wide management information system to report on all state-aided library activities. This plan will be based on tasks 1 through 3, and will prescribe the operational details for a management information system. The planning will include development and pretesting of reporting forms, instructional manuals, and methods of data collection, data analysis and dissemination of the data in their final form. Cost: 2-3 person years: $100,000.

6. (MIIMPL) Implementation. The SLP should implement the management information system covering all state-aided library activities including the evaluation data mentioned above. Cost depends on specifics of the plan.

5.3.3 *Research and Information.* Description: A fine line must be drawn between basic pure research and that research necessary for the decisions that need to be made in operating the complex array of libraries in the state. We do not propose that the state engage in or

support basic research. We do propose that it recognize that certain information is required for decision making and that it take whatever steps it must to acquire it. It is proposed that SLP concentrate on (a) dissemination of existing information on research and cooperative activities and (b) studies of user attitudes and needs. (Note that this program is related to the Evaluative Program prescribed in 5.3.2, to the extent that the data developed under both programs complement one another. Both kinds of data will be critical for informed decision making. This program is considered a cooperative program, since the results will be useable by all libraries in the state, and will provide support for decision related to cooperation.)

Priority: B

Tasks: 1. (INOPER) Operate an information dissemination system for research results and cooperative library activities. This could range from a minimal program of contributing a one-page article to the journals or bulletins of library associations in the state, to establishment of an information center to disseminate and collect the information. The latter approach is recommended. Cost: $0 to $10,000 per year.

2. (USANAL) Analysis of user requirements and attitudes. Periodically, about every five years, studies should be made of users of library systems in the state to determine their use patterns, information requirements, the extent to which they are met by the systems, and user attitudes toward the system. The objective is to provide the information on which client-centered information programs can be developed and operated. Cost: $25,000 every five years.

5.4 Legislation, Regulation and Standards

5.4.1 *Legislation.* Description: We recommend modifications to The Library Code, Act of June 14, 1961, P.L. 324, as amended January 3, 1972 to accomplish the following objectives: (1) establish as an objective of the Commonwealth, the provision of information services to its citizens and organizations; (2) authorize the State Library to extend services and support to libraries of all types and to library cooperative organizations when this is determined by the State Librarian to be in the public interest; (3) authorize out-of-state libraries to join state-aided library cooperatives under conditions established by the State Librarian.

Priority: A

Tasks: 1. The State Library, working through the Department of Education, should propose amendments to the existing Library Code to provide for the following:

1. In Article I, a statement of purpose to the effect that the Commonwealth recognizes information as a basic need of all its citizens and undertakes to provide information services of uniform high quality to all citizens, as necessary to their economic, physical and social well-being or cultural enrichment, and to institutions and corporate entities that

contribute to the economic, physical, social or cultural well-being of the Commonwealth; and that information is essential to learning, and learning is not restricted to formal school environments; and that whether concerned with the verification of an isolated fact or the mastery of a subject, all citizens benefit from the availability of information to all.

2. In Article I, Section 102, following the definition of a "local library" add definitions of "academic," "special" and "school" libraries and "library and information service cooperatives," which would authorize the State Librarian to provide aid to any of these institutions, whether or not it is state-aided, in exchange for that institution's services to the public or some segment of it. For example, the State Librarian might make an agreement with a privately-owned special library to provide interlibrary loan services or act as a back-up to a Regional Resource Center, in return for authorization for it to join a state-aided consortium or even to receive direct state funds. The nature of services to be provided by a library and of the state support to be received should be determined in each individual case by the State Librarian. The right to use the service of DLC's and RRC's should be included. The May, 1969 statement of objectives for the State Library, issued by the then Department of Public Instruction in its program budget, specifies that the State Library provide services to "public, academic and special libraries throughout the state." This legislative recommendation is in keeping with that objective.

3. Article II, Section 201, paragraph (10) should be expanded to authorize the State Library to expend funds to support cooperative activities among libraries and library cooperatives of any of the types defined in Article I, Section 102, including but not limited to: direct funding of cooperatives, reimbursement to individual libraries or cooperatives for services rendered to the State Library or other libraries or cooperatives, by prior written agreement with the State Librarian, or provision of services, training or equipment to such libraries or cooperatives or to the staff members thereof or provision of research or consulting services to the State Library or such other libraries or library service cooperatives as the State Librarian may designate.

4. Article III, Section 302, should include after paragraph (5) a provision for libraries outside the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to participate in cooperatives supported by state funds under either of the following conditions: (a) the library desiring to participate pays to the cooperative the actual full cost of services it receives, or (b) the State Librarian rules that the state in which the proposed participating library is located carries out a policy of reciprocation with the Commonwealth so that there is approximately a net equal exchange of services between the respective states, through individual libraries or cooperatives, even if not fully equal in each case.

5.4.2 *Regulation.* Description: Regulations are needed for the operation and governance of DLC's, RRC's and other libraries and cooperatives receiving state aid. These should be based on the evaluation criteria

developed under 5.3.2. In addition, whenever state assistance is provided to an organization, such as a consortium or District Library Center, to operate on behalf of other institutions, regulations should provide for representative governance of that organization. This does not imply that all beneficiaries of a service, large and small, have the same vote, but it does imply that all should be adequately represented on a governing board. As the state-wide system of library cooperation grows, it can be expected that more regulations will be necessary to keep the disparate component organizations working together.

Priority: C

Tasks: 1. (RGPLAN) Develop regulations for District Library Centers and Regional Resource Centers and for state-aided cooperatives. Cost: ½ person year, 1 elapsed year: $17,000.

2. (RGEVAL) The State Library should periodically review the need for additional regulations and develop and disseminate them as needed.

5.4.3 *Standards.* Description: Standards should be established in some areas in which legislation or formal regulation are not appropriate. Usually standards are voluntary (that is, enforcement is not practicable). At this time, standards are needed in interlibrary lending codes since practices vary substantially from library to library. Eventually, there may be a need for standardization of forms of information exchange, such as data on acquisition policy or collection specialty. A standard for interlibrary lending that does not discriminate against any class of borrower, is recommended as the first task. Since lending codes that contain this form of restriction are frequently violated anyway, a change merely authorizes all borrowers to borrow in the most efficient manner. Also, codes should seek to prohibit bans on lending between types of institutions, e.g. from public to private libraries, or from school to public libraries.

Priority: C

Tasks: 1. (STOPER) The SLP should establish a voluntary standards panel. Members should not be paid, but the SLP should provide administrative support to the organization, and take responsibility for promulgation of results. The panel should plan its own specific rules and relationships to other organizations, such as professional societies. Cost: $5,000 per year, indefinitely (travel and expenses).

5.5 Information and Referral Service

5.5.1 *I & R Consortium and Assistance.* Description: We recognize I & R services as a desirable new information service and predict that they will become an expected, demanded public service over the next ten years. Therefore, we need to plan for their eventual appearance.

Priority: C

Tasks: 1. (IRPLAN) Plan. The SLP should sponsor a brief survey of I & R services in Pennsylvania and other states, and the demand or plans for them within the state. A plan should be drawn up for the SLP's

participation when local communities implement their own centers. This participation should include assistance in finding state-wide information for the center, in developing local technology for I & R service, and in training staff. Cost: ½ person year, $17,000.

5.6 Implementation

We assume the principal office for implementing these proposed programs will be the Bureau of Library Development of the State Library. To implement all objectives, this office will need more personnel or will need to contract for much of the work that might otherwise be done in-house. The bureau will become more than an advisory office. It will be the executive agent for a large, state-wide library network. Its mission will be to manage as well as coordinate this network. Upon its strength and leadership much of the outcome of this plan will depend.

We have estimated additional costs to this office of $25,000 for the first year and $50,000 thereafter (task SLPOPN). This will cover a gradual build up of two additional staff members plus additional travel that will be necessary to increase contact with local librarians in the bureau's role as executive management agency.

Although we have included cost estimates wherever possible for tasks we have recommended, we feel that even without a budget increase in many cases progress can be made by stimulating local librarians to create consortia where they do not exist, or to work within existing consortia toward the objectives proposed here. While it would certainly facilitate adoption of these programs if they were fully funded by the state it must be recognized that state funding cannot be depended upon as a constant source of operational support, year in and year out. If a state-wide library system bringing the information resources of the state to all its citizens is desirable, and if the cooperative programs suggested herein are desirable, library managers may have to discontinue some traditional activities in favor of new cooperative ones.

Total implementation of this plan will require new money, new initiative by the State Library, the support of the library community of the Commonwealth, and commitment to a state-wide information program by the state's policy makers and funding authority. The library professional societies of the state could assist by organizing local support for the concept of a library network for the state and its support by the legislature.

5.7 Five Year Budget

The budget below presents a time-phased cost estimate for a period of five years. We have assumed a modest beginning, with some growth, eventually reaching a state of equilibrium as regards new spending. These are the costs beyond current State Library funding levels.

No allowance has been made for inflation or other changes in the value of 1976 dollars.

Several tasks have no budget estimate because an estimate is heavily dependent upon a planning or analysis task not yet undertaken. We

have included a single line item to cover all these and point out that this line is not based on an individual task-by-task analysis. It is, therefore, more a ceiling for these tasks than an actual estimate of their cost. Lack of data available at this time precludes any other approach.

In the table on the pages following, column 1 shows the task number as described in Section 5, column 2 a short code for the task title and the page reference for its description, column 3 the total estimated cost of the task, column 4 the priority, and the remaining columns a year-by-year projection of costs.

Each cost item posted to the table carries with it its priority designation. In this table the symbol '—' implies no cost in the given year for the task. The symbol '•' implies that there may be or will be a cost, but that it cannot now be estimated. A ceiling for these items is suggested on the line "Unestimated items," and is added into the Grand Total.

Number	Description & Page	Total Cost	Priority	Cost per year in $1000's 1	2	3	4	5
5.1.1.1	LCPLAN	$ 34	A	34 A	—	—	—	—
2	LCIMPL	34	A	—	34 A	—	—	—
3	LCOPER	—	A	—	—	—	—	—
5.1.2.1	RRPLAN	34	B	—	34 B	—	—	—
2	RRIMPL	17	B	—	—	17 B	—	—
3	RROPER	—	B	—	—	—	—	—
5.1.3.1	ACPLAN	17	B	—	17 B	—	—	—
2	ACIMPL	17	B	—	—	17 B	—	—
3	ACOPER	*	B	—	—	—	*	*
5.1.4.1	ILPLAN	17	B	17 B	—	—	—	—
2	ILOPER	*	B	—	—	*	*	*
1	ILANAL	34	B	—	34 B	—	—	—
5.1.5.1	ELPLAN	34	B	—	34 B	—	—	—
2	ELEXT	*	B	—	—	*	*	*
3	ELOPER	750	B	—	—	250 B	250 B	250 B
5.1.6.1	DEANAL	17	B	—	17 B	—	—	—
2	DEPLAN	17	B	—	—	17 B	—	—
3	DEIMPL	*	B	—	—	—	*	*
4	DEOPER	*	B	—	—	—	*	*
5.2.1.1	OCPLAN	17	C	17 C	—	—	—	—
2	TSPLAN	34	C	—	34 C	—	—	—
3	TSIMPL	*	C	—	—	*	*	*
4	OCIMPL	86	C	—	12 C	12 C	6 C	6 C
5	OCANAL	42.5	C	8.5C	8.5C	8.5C	8.5C	8.5C
5.2.2.1	COANAL	34	C	—	—	34 C	—	—
2	MPANAL	34	C	34 C	—	—	—	—
3	AQPLAN	*	C	—	—	—	*	*
4	MAPLAN	*	C	—	*	*	*	*
5	MAIMPL	*	C	—	*	*	*	*
5.2.3.1	PEPLAN	17	C	—	17 C	—	—	—
2	POPLAN	17	C	—	17 C	—	—	—
3	EDOPER	80	C	—	—	10 C	10 C	10 C

Number	Description & Page	Total Cost	Priority	Cost per year in $1000's 1	2	3	4	5
5.2.4.1	TEOPER	50	B	10 B	10 B	10 B	10 B	10 B
2	TEANAL	19.3	B	—	19.3B	—	—	—
3	TEPLAN	*	B	—	—	*	*	*
5.2.5.1	INPLAN	17	C	—	17 C	—	—	—
2	INIMPL	*	C	—	—	*	*	*
3	INOPER	*	C	—	—	*	*	*
5.3.1.1	MGOPER	80	B	10 B	10 B	10 B	—	—
2	MGEVAL	—	B	—	—	—	—	—
3	MGIMPL	40	B	—	10 B	10 B	10 B	10 B
5.3.2.1	REPLAN	34	A	34 A	—	—	—	—
2	DLPLAN	34	A	—	34 A	—	—	—
3	CPPLAN	34	A	—	34 A	—	—	—
4	EVIMPL	—	A	—	—	—	—	—
5	MIPLAN	100	A	—	—	100 A	—	—
6	MIIMPL	*	A	—	—	—	*	*
5.3.3.1	INOPER	50	B	10 B	10 B	10 B	10 B	10 B
2	INANAL	25	B	—	—	25 B	—	—
5.4.1.1	LEPLAN	—	A	—	—	—	—	—
5.4.2.1	RGPLAN	17	C	17 C	—	—	—	—
2	RGEVAL	—	C	—	—	—	—	—
5.4.3.1	STOPER	25	C	5 C	5 C	5 C	5 C	5 C
5.5.1.1	IRPLAN	17	C	—	—	17 C	—	—
5.6	SUPOPN	225	A	25 A	50 A	50 A	50 A	
Unestimated items				—	42.2	47.5	240.5	240.5
Total priority A:				93	152	150	50	50
B:				47	195.3	366	280	280
C:				81.5	110.5	86.5	29.5	29.5
Grand Total (including unestimated items)				221.5	500	650	500	500

See 5.3.2)

6. FINDINGS

6.1 Status of Cooperative Library Efforts in Pennsylvania

6.1.1 *Existing Cooperative Efforts.* There is a great variety of cooperation among libraries in the State of Pennsylvania. In 1972, Wiest, Lourea, and Kenney identified over 65 cooperative ventures. In the intervening years, a number of these have disappeared, some new ones have been created, and others have persisted while altering their character. Existing cooperatives range from the very formal, such as Pennsylvania Area Library Network (PALINET) and Union Catalog of Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh Regional Library Center (PRLC), Lehigh Valley Association of Independent Colleges (LVAIC), Area College Library Cooperative Program (ACLCP), Central Pennsylvania Consortium (CPC), Interlibrary Delivery Service (IDS), District Library Centers, Northeastern Pennsylvania Bibliographic Center; to the very informal, such as an Intermediate Unit lending films without charge to a church-related school, or a special library permitting limited use of its facilities by local townspeople. The scale of cooperation likewise ranges from major, as in the case of PALINET, PRLC, and District Library Centers, to minor, as in the case of two or three public libraries engaged in coordinated purchasing of periodicals, or a school media center informing the local public library of impending classroom assignments.

The great majority of formal and informal, major and minor cooperative ventures address the needs of academic and public libraries. This may be due to the circumscribed needs of clients of special and school libraries. The special library is, by definition, limited in breadth to a relatively narrow range of topics. The school library, while ostensibly covering a wide range of subjects, limits the intensity of its coverage in the various subjects. To the extent that special and school libraries are naturally limited in the scope of their coverage, we would expect them to be more self-sufficient than their academic or public counterparts and thus less dependent on cooperative activities. However, their potential values in a cooperative effort are distinctly different: a special library would be expected to contain a rich store of lesser-known, infrequently held documents, whereas a school library would contain documents that are widely duplicated in other school libraries or public libraries and in some academic and special libraries.

Among school libraries the primary kind of cooperative efforts centers around obtaining access to expensive materials (for example, films) or to printed material for the higher-level (more intense) needs of the instructional staff, in the areas of educational theory or the curriculum topics.

The predominant ends of existing cooperative activities appear to be (1) to increase access to monograph materials, (2) to reduce the burden of technical processing, (3) to increase access to 16mm films, (4) to increase access to periodicals and, (5) to strengthen reference service.

Several major cooperative activities provide the *means* to these ends: centralized purchase and maintainance of film collections; reference back-up service by larger libraries; interlibrary delivery; OCLC; free photocopying for the exchange of periodical articles or tables of contents; periodical union lists; teletype systems; rotating collections; and, less frequently, coordinated purchasing of book or periodical titles.

Lesser *ends* of existing cooperative activities seem to be: (6) sharing expensive hardware, such as AV equipment, (7) sharing physical and human resources available for in-service training or continuing staff education, and (8) sharing the expertise of staff.

Rarely stated as objectives of cooperative ventures are (9) reducing the costs of microfilming materials, (10) reducing the costs of building centralized (and thus potentially inexpensive) stores of little-used materials, or (11) increasing the probability of success of users in searching for information.

Few strong patterns of inadequacy were expressed. There are some lacks, however, that were frequently expressed—and most of these by non-member libraries. Only the most recurrent of these are considered here:

(a) Smaller libraries, especially public and academic, often feel cut off from cooperative activities. They frequently expressed the need for direct access to OCLC service and for regular, frequent delivery service. (The many possible explanations for their lack of involvement are discussed below.)

(b) Several persons mentioned that PALINET, an unusually strong cooperative, might reasonably undertake cooperative activities in addition to its current ones.

(c) Public libraries reported varying levels of service provided by District Library Centers. Sometimes the small libraries feel that all DLC resources are spent on the larger libraries' needs, and sometimes the larger libraries feel that all the DLC's resources are being spent on the small libraries. In either case, it is apparent that some kind of performance accounting is desired for DLC's, and that small libraries need to assume a formal place in the decision making process of DLC's. Further, in speaking with persons representing Regional Resource Centers and DLC's, it is clear that the relationships among these libraries need clarification, particularly in the matter of nterlibrary loan.

(d) Many small libraries feel restricted in their use of existing interlibrary loan networks because they do not have frequent enough delivery to link them with external stores of documents and they do not have quick access to an inventory of materials available on interlibrary loan (i.e., a union listing).

(e) Access to 16mm films is irregular. Many librarians are displeased with the amount of time it takes to request and receive films and with the waiting time required for the most popular ones.

(f) There is strong feeling among academic, school and public libraries of all sizes that there needs to be a body that would foster the develop-

ment of library cooperation in the state. Such a body might take responsibility for developing a unified plan of cooperation for various areas of the state, would seek aggressively to promote the adoption of the plan (through financial or other incentives) and would oversee the impact of cooperative efforts and suggest changes in them. Most respondents mentioned the State Library or an arm of the State Library as the most logical home for such an undertaking. Stronger than any other expression of the respondent group was the cry for aggressive planning for and promotion of cooperative activity by a strengthened State Library.

(g) A general condition of library cooperation in the state is the lack of measures that would indicate levels of performance of the cooperative ventures. While there are some few exceptions, it is safe to say that the value and costs of cooperative programs have not been demonstrated in systematic ways to their users—either libraries or clients.

6.2 The Atmosphere for Further Cooperation

The cooperative ventures in Pennsylvania are many, if uneven. Most librarians have experience with at least one formal or informal activity. This contains some advantages for further cooperation. First, some existing cooperative activities may actually provide the organizational base for better cooperative enterprises. The strength of such entities as PALINET, PRLC, the District Library Centers, the Lehigh Valley Association of Independent Colleges and Interlibrary Delivery Service is obvious and may offer ready-made vehicles for new means of cooperative activity in the state.

Second, the fact that many librarians in the state are involved in some kind of cooperation may have laid a groundwork of attitudes at least somewhat favorable to additional cooperation. (Although it is possible that the limits of some kinds of cooperation have already been reached.)

Again and again, the human element has been identified as the key element in determining whether most cooperative ventures will be a success or a failure. The most dramatic of cooperative ventures can be expected to necessitate the acquiring of new, (that is, broader) loyalties by the cooperating parties; acquiring new loyalties touches upon such factors as territoriality, inertia, world-view and personality of the individuals concerned. It seems to work best among people who are most naturally friendly with each other and among people who associate frequently in connection with professional activities. The most successful ventures are likely to be the ones consisting of friendly, selfless members one of whom is an inspired charismatic leader. (It must be noted that some cooperative efforts—such as OCLC—are based on merit and sheer "market value." That is, the members are bound together by virtue of the obvious, almost tangible, benefits that accrue to each of them. A cooperative service that is subsidized by an outside entity—such as Interlibrary Delivery Service—may appear to bind its

members together by virtue of its "obvious benefits," whereas, in fact, its real appeal has yet to be tested against the pocketbooks of the participating libraries. Such a test will come shortly when subsidies for IDS will be withdrawn.)

Such human factors are not only important considerations among the principal actors in the venture, such as the directors of the various institutions, but also are critical among those who come in contact with the cooperative activity at any point in its processes—for instance, clerks who type interlibrary loan requests and librarians who search titles or take requests.

On the negative side of the ledger is the thought that in 1976 the easiest work may be behind us. The most obvious and palatable cooperation may already be underway. The emphasis on *further* cooperation may have to shift from creating dramatic new types of cooperative programs to the more subtle work of making existing ones operate faster or cheaper, serve more people or involve more libraries. It is probably safe to say that the easiest jobs have been done *to some degree*.

Librarians generally seem to recognize the potential savings that might be realized through increased cooperation. However, librarians do not all feel the financial pressures to the same degree. County and small state institutional libraries seem to feel financial burdens least; if this is the case, we might expect them to feel less compelled to seek new ways of securing needed resources for their libraries (among them cooperative activities).

It is likely, however, that most of the state's libraries suffer from constricted budgets, in which there is little room for discretionary spending. Large proportions of their budgets are dedicated to personnel costs, costs that are difficult to reduce. Many librarians—primarily those in medium and small institutions of all kinds—declared that they could not consider engaging in any new cooperative activity, however attractive, with their current level of staffing. It seems clear that additional cooperative activities will be impeded to some degree by the lack of discretionary funds and by the apparent inflexibility of existing staff assignments. The only cooperative ventures that would be attractive to some librarians would be ones that either require no addition or reallocation of local staff time, or would actually result in a savings of staff time (for instance, receiving pre-processed materials, shelf-ready and at a very low or zero cost).

It is quite clear that the geography of Pennsylvania imposes some constraints on cooperative ventures. Pennsylvania could be seen as two states, split vertically somewhere through its center. As well, there are areas that seem to be distinct regions of the state, operating as semi-independent and coherent regions and somewhat isolated from other areas. The northeast, northwest, south central, and north central are four such areas.

There are also constraints to cooperation with libraries in other states.

These are not geographical constraints; they are primarily legal/political. In fact, these legal/political limitations may work to confound cooperation among libraries in a natural geographical region which happens to include parts of several states—such as Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia; Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, and Delaware; Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. The greatest attitudinal constraint is the disinclination to spend Pennsylvania dollars to support activities that would benefit the citizens of other states.

The high unit cost of audiovisual materials—especially 16mm films—compels many librarians to desire improved methods of sharing these materials. This may be one of the most fruitful areas for improvement of cooperative activity, for two reasons. First, most small and medium libraries are unused to having a reasonable store of audiovisual materials in-house and therefore may not harbor a territorial interest in having "their own" audiovisual collection. Second, the high cost of 16mm films is an impelling reason to purchase, process, store and distribute those materials in some sort of shared way.

The pending copyright legislation may pose a problem for many cooperative activities that are planned or exist already. This will be especially true of programs for sharing periodicals. If fees to publishers are required for interlibrary copying, it may be worthwhile to consider a small number of larger interlibrary loan operations, such as a central periodicals loan bank for the state, if this would be legally feasible. Such an operation, while presenting some distinct disadvantages, (such as time and distance) would simplify the process of accounting that publishers' fees will require.

6.2.1 *Principles for Improving Cooperation.* Based upon recommendations from the State Library staff who are administering this project and upon the impressions gleaned from interviews and group discussions, we have established several principles which have guided the development of our plan for improving Pennsylvania's cooperative activities.

1. To include all types of libraries—academic, public, school and special—in cooperative activities, to the extent that their unique needs allow. The widely varied human and material resources held by all kinds of libraries in the state would constitute a broad and intense kind of wealth, if they were made more readily accessible.
2. To build from existing strengths. As was mentioned above, many existing cooperative ventures could, through expansion of their geographic coverage or services offered, serve as strong bases for improved cooperation.
3. To add no new levels to the cooperative hierarchies that now exist. This means not increasing the number of levels through which a client's request is processed, and not increasing the number of administrative positions in cooperative ventures, wherever possible.

4. To develop alternative programs for cooperation in the state, and arrange them by priority. The nature of public funding makes it imperative that there be funded and unfunded alternative plans of action.
5. To utilize existing document control systems (such as OCLC), wherever possible. It is not feasible, financially, for Pennsylvania to develop a competing system with the capabilities and potential of ones already in operation, especially in view of the likelihood that service costs in these systems will continue to fall over the short term future.

7. REVIEW OF APPLICABLE LITERATURE

7.1 Other States' Plans

The Library Services and Construction Act (P.L. 91-600) required all states to submit five-year state plans, including plans for library cooperation, to the Office of Education during the early 1970's. Some states have already issued plans for the second five year span or supplements to their original plans. Individual state plans varied in their usefulness to our deliberations and in their applicability to the Pennsylvania situation, and the plans themselves showed great diversity. In general, the plans are non-specific in nature, especially in those areas dealing with library cooperation. However, it was possible to discern recurrent themes which have application to the Pennsylvania situation. Repeatedly, these areas were stressed:

1. That improving the State Library (or its equivalent) is a necessary first step in fostering library cooperation. Specifically:
   a. revision of state statutes to increase the authority of the State Library over all types of libraries.
   b. revision of state statutes to allow libraries to form larger governmental units (consolidated systems) and to cooperate with libraries across state lines.
   c. revision of state statutes to change the position of the State Library within the governmental hierarchy, in order to improve the State Library's effectiveness. (Most were bureaus within State Department of Education.)
   d. improve the physical and human resources available to the State Library through new buildings and increases in staff.
2. That the broad goal of "equal access for all citizens" be the basic premise of library plans.
3. That continuing education of library personnel be given an expanded role.
4. That service can best be provided by funding existing institutions to be "area resource centers," to offer a level of service to districts within a state before requests are forwarded to state libraries.
5. That, in terms of specific efforts toward cooperation, the following "hierarchy of aspirations" was recognized.
   a. develop a communication network
   b. develop a delivery system (other than U.S. mail)
   c. develop a periodicals locator system
   d. develop a monograph locator system
   e. improve each of the above through the use of more advanced technology (TWX, computers, etc.)
6. Other specific cooperative activities frequently mentioned include:
   a. cooperative storage facilities. Many plans mention; but all agree more study is needed. Not a high priority.

b. last copy depository. Mentioned by many states. Several do have active programs.
c. processing centers. Some states have centers, some states want centers, and at least one state has closed its center. The economics of centers vis-a-vis other sources of processing appears to be murky, although they can be viewed as a means of supporting standardized cataloging practices and as a subsidy for small libraries.
d. reference network. Seen as a high priority by many states, although difficult to set up and monitor.

7. Coordination was seen by many states as the key to successful cooperation efforts. The State Library, an active consortium, even an independent agency (e.g., switching center) could be used as the focus of state-wide efforts.

7.2 Models for Statewide Cooperation

Several states, notably Illinois and New York, have made great progress in cooperative activities within their borders. Several variations seem possible, one being by geographic area, the other by type of library. The Illinois system feeds requests from local units to area systems libraries and from there to six backup resource centers (two state universities, the State Library, and the John Crerar, Chicago Public, and the University of Chicago libraries). These reference and research center libraries receive basic grants plus fees based on the number of transactions handled. Illinois has the added flexibility of not being tied to categorical aid to individual libraries; rather, it funds cooperatives and projects.

New York State's ILL system (NYSILL) funnels requests from the local library to area systems headquarters, then to the State Library in Albany. The New York State Library then can send the request on to either (1) "area referral libraries" (three large public libraries) or (2) "subject referral libraries" (nine special, university and public libraries with outstanding subject strengths). In this manner requests are filled at the closest geographic point where possible, or "switched" by the State Library to the appropriate subject library, while making sure to evenly spread the number of requests. Flexibility allows large institutions to bypass the sending of requests through the State Library, while regulations keep the system from becoming flooded with requests which individual libraries are expected to fulfill through purchase (e.g., popular fiction). Both the New York and Illinois systems are well documented in the publications of their respective state libraries, *BOOKMARK* and *ILLINOIS LIBRARIES*.

7.3 The National Scene

A review of the literature on cooperative developments at the national level, especially that literature pertaining to proposed national networks, was studied for implication for the Pennsylvania environment.

The final draft report of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science[1] and the detailed WESTAT[2] study in particular were looked to as the most current and most realistic analyses of how state cooperative systems would fold into a national network. Applicable quotes from the WESTAT report include:

> "Development within the individual states will primarily be the responsibility of the State Library Agency..."
>
> "Within the states, resource sharing may be developed as best meets the needs of the libraries involved"
>
> "States will be required to reach some minimal level of resource sharing capability..."
>
> "Functions of state resource centers will be threefold:...to meet the needs of in-state libraries, to transmit unfilled requests outside the state..., and to meet the resource needs of out-of-state libraries..."
>
> "...(cooperation will) retain much of this diversity, but superimpose the requirement that all libraries within the state be provided some channel of access to the state resource center,..."

Thus, the following generalizations might be made about the interaction of state cooperative activities within a national network:

1. An effort would be made to integrate current cooperative ventures into a national system, rather than beginning from the ground up.
2. Organization within state borders is needed and recommended, but specific organizational framework is left to the discretion of each state. The literature is permissive rather than perscriptive on this issue.
3. Much interaction with a national network would be through a focal point within each particular state, or perhaps several in larger or more populous states. In many cases this would be the State Library, although it could be an independent bibliographic center, a consortium, or a particular library.
4. Computer applications (e.g., union catalogs) would be the area of greatest sensitivity requiring adherence to standards to avoid conflict with developing national data bases.

FOOTNOTES

1. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. *A National Program for Library and Information Services, Final Draft*. Washington, D.C.: NCLIS, 1975.
2. Palmour, Vernon E., et. al., *Resources and Bibliographic Support for a Nationwide Library Program. Final Report*. WESTAT, Inc. Washington, D.C.: GOP, 1974.

8. METHODOLOGY

The plan for cooperation among Pennsylvania's libraries (Section 2-5) and the discussion of atmosphere and priorities for further cooperation, (Section 6) all were based on two major methods: talking with librarians and information specialists in Pennsylvania, and reviewing available literature.

8.1 Site Interviews

Formal interviews with Pennsylvania librarians provided the primary informational base for the study. In addition, these interviews offered an opportunity to gather opinion data in key areas. The interviews were semi-structured and open-ended. They covered the following topics: cooperatives, formal and informal, that the library is now participating in; satisfactions and dissatisfactions with those cooperative activities; additional desired cooperative activities; concrete plans for future cooperation; factors that facilitate or hinder cooperative efforts. As well, interviewers were instructed to describe the extent to which the interviewees appeared to be receptive to further cooperative activities.

The interviews were conducted at the library sites by the four faculty investigators with assistance from [illegible] research assistants. Interviews varied from one-half hour to one and three-quarter hours in length, averaging perhaps one hour. Interviewees were head librarians or their designees.

The site interview process, including a semi-structured interview instrument was pre-tested on twelve librarians in the Philadelphia area. Following the pre-test, the interview schedule was prepared, and letters of introduction along with a list of topics to be included in the interview session were sent to members of the sample. (The letter of introduction and list of interview topics are included in Section 8.6.) After a lapse of at least one week, individuals in the sample were phoned, in order to establish a time for the interview.

8.2 Samples

Since the time and finances available for this study precluded probability sampling or exhaustive coverage of Pennsylvania's librarians, the sample size was arbitrarily set at one hundred persons, consistent with available resources for the study. A purposive sample of sixty librarians was drawn, stratified by type of library, geographic area, and size of library, in order to give these factors roughly equal representation. In each of five geographic areas of this state (Northeast, Northwest, Southeast, Southwest and Central), we selected one large, one small, and one medium sized library of each type (academic, public, school and special), for a total of sixty libraries. At least one person in each library was interviewed; sometimes more, if so recommended by the first interviewee. In selecting the sample of sixty, we also tried to include within the academic stratum, private and public and two-year, four-year

and graduate institutions; within the school stratum, private and public schools; and within the special stratum, a variety of topical interests, profit and non-profit based, public, private, archival, technical, institutional, scholarly, etc., libraries. It is obvious that, by trying to cover such a wide variety of libraries, little can be said about any *one* variety with any confidence. The result of the interviews was an informed "impression" of the overall condition of cooperation in Pennsylvania and the state's readiness for future cooperation.

In addition to the sixty libraries, forty selected opinion leaders were interviewed. They were chosen to represent such diverse interests as public library trustees, deans of library schools, directors of major academic and special libraries, representatives of major educational interests, heads of library professional organizations, and heads of special groups such as the State Library, the Governor's Advisory Committee, and the Pennsylvania Master Plan Committee. While many key figures in Pennsylvania librarianship were not included, this limited sample clearly skewed the study in favor of those in responsible positions and those with considered opinions on librarianship in Pennsylvania.

The sample of 100 is listed in Section 8.6.1.

8.3 Meeting with Heads of Consortia

In order to sample the opinion of people in existing consortia, a two-day meeting of twelve directors or representatives of library consortia was convened at Drexel University on April 6th and 7th, 1976. A list of the participants and their affiliations is given in 8.6.2. The agenda for the meeting included many of the topics covered in the state interviews. The meeting focused on factors that have led to the development of library cooperative efforts in Pennsylvania; barriers to such cooperations; prospects for inter-consortium cooperation; most needed emphases of future cooperation in the state; and alternatives for initiating additional cooperation both with and without new money at the state level.

8.4 Literature Review

The existing report literature related to notable achievements in library cooperation was reviewed. This information was incorporated into discussions and deliberations by the study team and contributed to the construction of the interview instrument, analysis of interview data, and the final recommendations.

8.5 Meetings with Advisory Committee and Consultants

A meeting was held in Harrisburg on June 10, 1976 with the Drexel project team, the State Librarian and members of his staff and an advisory committee of twenty-five persons selected by the State Library. An early draft of this plan was discussed; many changes were made as a result. A list of participants is found in Section 8.6.3.

The project team consulted with Alphonse Trezza, Executive Director of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, on organizational aspects of the plan; with David Bender, Assistant Director, Division of Library Development and Services of the Maryland State Department of Education, on school and public library cooperation; and with Ralph Blasingame, Professor of Library Service, Rutgers University, on the draft plan as a whole.

8.6 Interview and Meeting Data

8.6.1 The following list of interviewees is alphabetical (reading across), giving names and institutional or organizational affiliation. The letter of introduction sent to interviewees and the outline of interview topics follow.

Sister Mary Arthur, Director
Library Media Services
Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Mrs. Mary E. Barr
Butler County Community
College Library

Ms. Mary Barrett
King's College Library

Mrs. Nancy Bartlett
Whitehall Public Library

Mr. William Beck
Department Chairman
California State College Librarie.

Dr. Robert Bernreuter
Schlow Memorial Library

Mrs. Susan Bogden
Tamaqua Public Library

Ms. Jane F. Breslin
Industrial Health Foundation
Inc. Library

Ms. Patricia Broida
Back Mountain Memorial Library

Sister Bernita Burns
Director of Library Department
Archdiocese of Pittsburgh

Ms. Mimi Callahan
Librarian, Episcopal Academy
Ind. Sch. Lib. Assoc.

Ms. Eleanor Campion
Union Library Catalog

Mr. John Cane
Alcoa Technical Research Library
SLA—Pittsburgh Chapter

Mrs. Frances M. Comfort
Harrisburg Area Community College

Mr. Anthony Costanzo
Research and Engineering Library
Arco Chemical Company

Ms. Joan M. Costello
Osterhout Free Library

Mr. Harry R. Courtright
Harrisburg Public Library

Mr. George Daniels
Acting Director
Bucknell University Library

Ms. Marie Davis
Associate Director
Free Library of Philadelphia

Ms. Marjorie Davis, Director
Montgomery County Community
College Library

Mr. Richard DeGennaro, Director
University of Pennsylvania Library

Ms. Joan Diana
Director of School Libraries
Pennsylvania Dept. of Education

Mr. Ernest E. Doerschuk, Jr.
State Librarian

Mr. Edmond J. Doherty
Reading Public Library

Mr. Keith Doms, Director
Free Library of Philadelphia

Mrs. Mollie Douglas
Penn Hills Public Library

Ms. Ruth Ann Edwards
Wilson College Library

Mr. John Fetterman
WEBNET Project
University of Pittsburgh

Mr. Stephen Folts
Chatham College Library
PRLC, Executive Director

Mr. Frank Fox
Scranton Times Library

Mrs. Evelyn C. Fretz
Wyomissing Public Library

Mr. Thomas Galvin, Dean
Graduate School of Library Science
University of Pittsburgh

Mr. Dan W. Graves
Clarion State College Library

Mr. Arthur Hamlin, Director
Temple University Library

Ms. Mildred Hart
Coordinator of School Libraries
Radnor Township Schools

Mr. Frank Helms
West Chester State College Library

Mr. David Hoffman, Coordinator
Interlibrary Cooperation
Bureau of Library Development
State Library of Pennsylvania

Mrs. Janice Horn
Clarion State College Library

Ms. Linda Katz
Wolfsohn Memorial Library

Ms. Jean Knapp, Director
Bala School/Bala Cynwyd Library

Mrs. Helen Lamrey
Coatings and Resin Division Research Center Library
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Ind. Inc.

Mrs. Helen Lovett
Extension Librarian
Bucks County District Library Center

Mr. James D. Mack
Lehigh University Library

Mr. Martin Murray, Associate Dean
Pattee Library
Pennsylvania State University

Mr. Russell J. Emele
East Stroudsburg State College Library

Ms. Jean B. Ferguson
Lower Merion Library Association

Dr. Stuart Forth, Dean
Pennsylvania State University Library

Ms. Pearl Frankenfeld, Director
Norristown Public Library

Ms. June Fulton
MERMLS

Mrs. Alice Gertzog
Meadville Public Library

Ms. Naomi Haag, Librarian
Mt. Penn School
Antietam School District

Ms. Anna Harkins
Pittsburgh Public School Libraries

Mrs. Irene Heaps
Hershey Public Library

Ms. Betsy Hoffman, Dean
School of Library Science
Villanova University

Ms. Ilse Hontz
Free Library of Philadelphia

Mrs. Isabelle Hyames
Meadville City Hospital Library

Mr. Allen Kent
WEBNET Project
University of Pittsburgh

Mr. William Lafranchi, Director
Indiana University of Pennsylvania Library

Mr. George Lenz, Director
Media Services
ARIN Intermediate Unit

Mr. Jack Luskay
President
Pennsylvania School Librarians' Assn.

Mr. Anthony Martin, Director
Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh

Mrs. Margaret McDonnell, Librarian
Hooverville Elementary School

Ms. Kay R. McFarland, Chairman
Steering Committee
Area College Library Cooperative Program

Mr. James Meade
Benner Springs Research Station Library
Pennsylvania Fish Commission

Sister Constance Melvin
Marywood College Library

Mr. Leon K. Montgomery
WEBNET Project
University of Pittsburgh

Ms. Margaret L. Moser
Allegheny College Library

Ms. Joan Myers, Director
School District of Philadelphia

Ms. Barbara Nanstiel
Mercy Hospital Medical Library

Mrs. Sue Neiman
Middletown Public Library

Mrs. Barbara Oldt, Librarian
Mifflinburg Area High School

Mr. Paul J. Pugliese
Duquesne University Library

Mr. Ray Roedell
Norristown State Hospital Library

Mrs. Glenora Rossell
Director of University Libraries
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. Elizabeth Rupert, Dean
Department of Library Science
Clarion State College

Ms. Patricia Ann Sacks
Educational Ventures, Inc.

Mr. Frank Sessa
GSLIS, University of Pittsburgh

Mr. Kenneth C. Sivulich
Erie Metropolitan Library

Mrs. Geraldine Smith
McCord Memorial Library

Mrs. Barbara Steigerwalt, Trustee
Luddington Public Library

Mrs. Margaret McGeever, Librarian
Blue Mountain High School

Mrs. Patricia Meck
Reynolds Experimental Laboratory Library
Atlas Power Company

Mrs. George Metzdorf
Trustee
West Shore Public Library

Mr. Elliott Morse, Director
College of Physicians Library

Ms. Marcie Murphy
WEBNET Project
University of Pittsburgh

Mr. Laurence Nanney
Kiskiminetas Springs Prep. School

Mr. Robert F. Nawrocki
Historical Society of York County Library

Mr. Benton Nulph
North Clarion Elementary School Library

Mr. Phillip Perkins
Northeastern Area Experiment Station Library
U.S. Forest Service

Mrs. Carol Richardson, Librarian
Blue Ridge High School

Ms. Linda B. Robinson
Community College of Allegheny County Library

Mr. James Rubinate
Elementary School Library Coordinator
Green Street School

Mr. William Ryan
Bloomsburg State College Library

Miss Margaret Schumacher
Instructional Materials Center
Erie School District

Mrs. Dorothy Simons, Librarian
Westerly Parkway Senior High School

Dr. Arden Smith
Central Pennsylvania Consortium

Mrs. Ruth Snyder
Pennsylvania Legislative Reference Bureau Library

Mrs. Kathryn Stephanoff, Director
Allentown Public Library

Mr. Nicholas Stevens, Dean
Department of Library Science
Kutztown State College

Mr. Anthony Stokes
Kiskiminetas Springs Prep. School

Mr. Jim Williams
WEBNET Project
University of Pittsburgh

Mr. Emory Wimbish, Jr.
Tri-State College Library Cooperative

Mrs. Margaret Wyatt, Librarian
Brownsville Area High School

Ms. Lois A. Zook, Librarian
Lancaster Mennonite High School

Mr. Robert Stewart
PALINET/ULC

Mr. John Timour
Thomas Jefferson University Library

Mrs. Susanne Wilson
Hammermill Paper Company
Technical Library

Mr. Stephen Wood, Coordinator
Inter-Library Delivery Service

Mrs. Mary Zahniser, Librarian
Meadville Area High School

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear :

The State Library of Pennsylvania has contracted with the Graduate School of Library Science to develop a plan for cooperation among all types of libraries and information centers in the state of Pennsylvania. Before drafting the plan, however, we need to talk with people in many key libraries or information centers around the state, in order to determine existing types of cooperation and tomorrow's needs for cooperative efforts. (These can be treated without regard to existing state-wide plans.)

Within the next month or two, we would like a member of our study team to talk with you for about an hour. We look forward to your input on the crucial issue of cooperation among libraries and information centers. If you have any questions before we call, don't hesitate to contact us at (215) 895-2491.

Recognizing the many demands on you, we very much appreciate the contribution of your time. The interview will be semi-structured; for the most part, we are interested in your considered judgement and a few facts about cooperative efforts related to your library or information center, your opinion about library cooperation in general, and anything else you would like to volunteer on the topic. On the attached page you will find a summary of the topics we will cover in the interview.

A member of the study team will contact you by telephone to set up an appointment. If you feel that there is someone more appropriate than you for us to talk with about cooperative efforts, you can tell us at that time.

Sincerely yours,

Charles T. Meadow
Professor of Information Science
Project Director

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW TOPICS

In order to speed the interviewing process, you may wish to consider these topics beforehand. You may even find it convenient to write out your response to question 1.

1. List and describe all cooperative arrangements—formal and informal—between your library or information center (or department of it) and other libraries, information centers or information-related agencies of any kind.

The description should include, where possible,

- name of the cooperative venture
- members (a general description will do)
- length of your membership
- major functions
- cost to you for participating
- who first conceived of it
- why it came into being

For the purpose of this study, we are defining a cooperative arrangement as

> An agreement among libraries and/or information centers to share or purchase resources of any kind—such as services, materials, skills, facilities, manpower, equipment, or processes.

2. What are your major satisfactions and problems with these cooperative arrangements?

3. What new kinds of cooperative activities would you find useful to your library/information center and your client group?

4. Are you planning new cooperative programs? What are they?

5. What are the factors that facilitate or inhibit cooperation on the part of your library/information center? On the part of *other* libraries/information centers?

6. Are there any special factors that would facilitate or inhibit cooperation among different *types* of libraries/information centers?

8.6.2 The Participants in the meeting with heads of consortia mentioned in Section 8.3 are listed alphabetically, giving consortium affiliation.

Alice Bartz
School Library Development Advisor
School District of Philadelphia

Sara Carr
Northeastern Pennsylvania Bibliographic Center

Harry R. Courtright, Chairman
District Library Center Administrators' Council

Stephen Folts, Executive Director
PRLC

William Lafranchi, Chairman
Council of Pennsylvania State College and University Library Directors

Kay R. McFarland, Chairman
Steering Committee
Area College Library Cooperative Program

William Ryan
Susquehanna Library Cooperative

Patricia Ann Sack
Director, Cedar Crest College Library and Muhlenburg State College Library

Robert Stewart
PALINET/ULC

Kathy Vick
Mid-Eastern Regional Medical Library Service

Emory Wimbish, Jr.
President, Tri-State College Library Cooperative

Steve Wood, Coordinator
Interlibrary Delivery Service of Pennsylvania

Representatives of the State Library of Pennsylvania: Ms. Pat Broderick and Mr. David Hoffman

8.6.3 Participants in the advisory committee meeting mentioned in Section 8.5 are listed alphabetically, giving institutional or organizational affiliation.

Melvin Bennett, Chairman
PLA Special Libraries Division

Joseph Bruno
Coordinator for Community Colleges
Penna. State Dept. of Education

Ruth Burns
SLA—Philadelphia Chapter

Sara Carr
Northeastern Pennsylvania Bibliographic Center

Harry R. Courtright, Chairman
District Library Center Administrators' Council

Bruce Daniels, Chairman
PLA Children's, Young People's and School Librarians' Division

Richard Dumeresq, Coordinator
State College and University
Penn. State Dept. of Education

Stuart Forth, Dean
Pennsylvania State University Library

June Fulton
Mid-eastern Regional Medical Library Service

George M. Jenks
PLA College and Research Library Division

Allen Kent, Chairman
PLA Resource Sharing Committee

Nancy L. Kintz
Special Libraries Association, Pittsburgh Chapter

Ruth Kolarik
Pennsylvania Learning Resources Association

Jack Luskay, President
Pennsylvania School Librarians Association

Joy Mazar
PLA County-Public Library Division

William Ryan
Susquehanna Library Cooperative

Barbara Steigerwalt, Chairman
PLA Trustee Division

Kathy Vick
Mid-Eastern Regional Medical Library Service

Steve Wood, Coordinator
Interlibrary Delivery Service of Pennsylvania

William Lafranchi, Chairman
Council of Pennsylvania State College and University Library Directors

Anthony Martin, President
PRLC

Kay R. McFarland, Chairman
Steering Committee
Area College Library Cooperative Program

Patricia Ann Sacks
Educational Ventures, Inc.

Robert Stewart
PALINET/ULC

Emory Wimbish, Jr., President
Tri-State College Library Cooperative

Representatives of the State Library of Pennsylvania:

Ernest E. Doerschuk, Jr.
David Hoffman
Ann Braxton
Atu Faruquee

Elizabeth Funk
Ron Krash
Charles Peguese

9. GLOSSARY

ACLCP	Area College Library Cooperation Program
DLC	District Library Center
CPC	Central Pennsylvania Consortium
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
I & R	Information and Referral
IDS	Interlibrary Delivery Service of Pennsylvania
ILL	Interlibrary Loan
IU	Intermediate Unit
LSCA	Library Services and Construction Act
LVAIC	Lehigh Valley Ass'n of Independent Colleges
MERMLS	Mid-Eastern Regional Medical Library Service
OCLC	Ohio College Library Center
PALINET	Pennsylvania Area Library Network
PLA	Pennsylvania Library Association
PRLC	Pittsburgh Regional Library Center
PUC	Pennsylvania Union Catalog
RRC	Regional Resource Center
SLA	Special Libraries Association
SLC	Susquehanna Library Cooperative
SLP	State Library of Pennsylvania
TCLC	Tri-State College Library Consortium
ULC	Union Library Catalog of Pennsylvania
UPS	United Parcel Service
WEBNET	Western Pennsylvania Buhl Network